

### **REMARKS**

The present Amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

The Office Action pointed out that this application currently named joint inventors. Applicants asserted that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made.

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 4, 6, 7, 10-21, 23-25, 27-31 and 33-51 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 22, 26 and 32 are canceled. Claims 23-25, 27-29 and 42-51 were allowed. Claims 4, 6, 13, 16-20 and 30 have been amended.

Claims 8 and 32 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. In making these cancellations without prejudice, Applicants reserve all rights in these claims to file divisional and/or continuation patent applications.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 23-25, 27-29, and 42-51 are allowed. The Examiner further stated that claims 6, 8, 13, 17-21, 32-38 and 41, which were objected to, would be allowable if amended to incorporate all the limitations of the respective base claims and any intervening claims.

Independent claim 30 has been amended to include the limitations of formerly depended claim 32, which was objected to and is now canceled. Claim 30 is the base claim of claims 31-41 and has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 32.

Applicants respectfully assert that this amendment does not narrow the scope of any of claims 31 and 33-41.

Claim 8 has been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 6, 13, 16-20 have been amended to include the limitation of their base claim, i.e., currently amended independent claim 4, and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully assert that this amendment does not narrow the scope of those claims.

Applicants wish to point out that there may have been a typographical error in paragraph 14 of the Office Action. The phrase "communications channel" apparently refers to the "communication terminal".

### **The Telephone Interview**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner, Demetria A. Williams, and the Supervising Primary Examiner, Chi Pham, for granting and attending an informal telephone interview with applicants and applicants' representatives, on June 11, 2003. In the informal interview, proposed amendments of claims 4 and 30 were discussed and the Examiner's position with regard to the claims was clarified to assist the applicants in preparing this response.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS**

#### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

The Office Action rejected claims 4, 7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Wolf in view of Butler.

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, applicants believe the rejections of claims 4, 7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

As is well established, an obviousness rejection requires a teaching or a suggestion by the relied upon prior art of all the elements of a claim (MPEP 2142). Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Wolf and Butler does not meet the requirements of an obviousness rejection in that neither reference teaches or suggests, at least, "based on the decoded message content moving the communication terminal to a sleep condition" as recited in amended claim 4. Applicants

therefore respectfully assert that neither Wolf nor Butler, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the limitations of claims 4. Since claims 7 and 10 are dependent from claim 4, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of these should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

The Office Action rejected claims 11, 12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Wolf in view of Butler and further view of Lundby.

Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 11, 12 and 14-16 are patentable over any combination of Wolf, Butler and/or Lundby. Claims 11, 12 and 14-16 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 4, and therefore include all the limitations of this claim. Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination of cited references, applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Wolf, Butler and Lundby does not meet the requirements of an obviousness rejection in that none of these reference teaches or suggests, at least, "based on the decoded message content moving the communication terminal to a sleep condition" as recited in amended claim 4. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 11, 12 and 14-16, are patentable over the combination of Wolf, Butler and Lundby at least based on the patentability of claim 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 11, 12 and 14-16.

The Office Action rejected claims 30, 31, 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lundby in view of Watanabe and Wolf.

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, applicants believe the rejections of claims 30, 31, 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

As is well established, an obviousness rejection requires a teaching or a suggestion by the relied upon prior art of all the elements of a claim (MPEP 2142). Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Lundby, Watanabe and Wolf does not meet the requirements of an obvious rejection in that none of these references teaches or suggests, at least, "altering the values of at least one of the received symbols of the frame to correspond to values of an expected message type" as recited in amended claim 30. Therefore, the rejection of independent claim 30 should be withdrawn. Furthermore, since claims 31, 39 and 40 are dependent from claim 30, applicants

APPLICANT(S): YELLIN ET AL.  
SERIAL NO.: 09/387,398  
FILED: 08/31/1999  
Page 11

respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

Applicants note that none of the amendments to the claims herein are in response to the above discussed prior art rejections.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 05-0649.

Respectfully submitted,

  
**Caleb Pollack**

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Registration No. **37,912**

Dated: July 10, 2003

**Eitan, Pearl, Latzer & Cohen Zedek, LLP.**  
10 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 1001  
New York, New York 10020  
Tel: (212) 632-3480  
Fax: (212) 632-3489